

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANTHONY STOCKER MINA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 16-01013

PAPPERT, J.

SEPTEMBER 8, 2016

MEMORANDUM

On July 28, 2016 the Court issued a Memorandum and Order (ECF Nos. 6 and 7) dismissing the complaint as well as a Motion for ECF Access filed by Anthony Stocker Mina (“Mina”). For the reasons explained in the Memorandum, the Court’s Order also enjoined Mina, without first obtaining leave of Court, from filing any pleading, motion or other paper in this and other pending civil actions or from initiating any new proceedings or actions against the United States or any of its agencies or employees. (ECF No. 7, ¶3.)

The Court based its decision to preclude Mina from further filings on the All Writs Act and Mina’s history of meritless and vexatious filings. (ECF No. 6, pp. 12-15.) The United States of America (“the Government”) had filed a Statement of Interest on behalf of judges and Clerk’s office employees in the District Court. (ECF No. 3.) The Government asked the Court to curb Mina’s numerous meritless actions and prevent him from continuing his vexatious conduct. (Id.) The Court found that the Statement of Interest, to which Mina failed to respond, provided Mina with the notice that a litigant is required to receive before he can be enjoined from further filings. (ECF No. 6 at p. 15.)

Mina subsequently represented to the Court that he did not respond to the Statement of Interest because he had never been served with it. (ECF No. 8.) The Court accordingly vacated only that part of its July 28 Order enjoining Mina from filing any further pleadings, motions or papers. Noting that Mina had by then been officially served with the Statement of Interest, the Court allowed Mina to file a response on or before September 6, 2016. (ECF No. 10.)

Mina timely filed his opposition to the Statement of Interest. (ECF No. 11.) Mina's response does nothing to alter the Court's July 28 reasoning. The document merely asserts, yet again, timeworn and frivolous allegations of misconduct, corruption and criminality against judges who at one time or another made decisions that Mina doesn't care for. Mina also attaches to his response a proposed amended complaint which alleges more of the same against an enhanced number of judges, employees of the District Court Clerk's office and even the Clerk of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Mina's original complaint has already been dismissed with prejudice. (ECF No. 7.) The filing of the Amended Complaint violates, among other things, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 and is stricken from the record.

An appropriate Order follows.

/s/ Gerald J. Pappert
GERALD J. PAPPERT, J.